

WILLIAM F. WINGATE,

VS.

No. 2:15-cv-00822-RAJ

CITY OF SEATTLE, SEATTLE POLICE
DEPARTMENT AND CYNTHIA
WHITLACH, in her official and individual
capacities,

**THE CITY DEFENDANTS' ANSWER
TO THE AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

JURY DEMAND

Defendants.

COME NOW City of Seattle and Seattle Police Department (collectively “the City Defendants”), by and through their attorneys of record, Peter S. Holmes, Seattle City Attorney, and Christine Olson, Assistant City Attorney, and hereby submit their Answer and Affirmative Defenses to Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint, and allege as follows:

I. PARTIES

1.1 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, deny the same at this time.

1.2 The City Defendants admit that the City of Seattle is a municipal corporation in the State of Washington. The City Defendants admit that the Seattle Police Department is part of the City of Seattle. The City Defendants deny any remaining allegations in this paragraph.

1 1.3 The City Defendants admit that Officer Cynthia Whitlatch was, at all relevant times, a
2 Seattle Police Department officer. Except as admitted, denied.

3 1.4 The City Defendants admit the allegations in this paragraph.

4 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 2.1 The City Defendants admit that this case has been removed to the U.S. District Court
6 for the Western District of Washington, which has subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's sole
7 federal cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for an alleged violation of plaintiff's Fourteenth
8 Amendment rights, and further admits that the Court may elect to assert supplemental jurisdiction over
9 plaintiff's separate state law claims. The City Defendants further admit that venue is proper. Except as
10 admitted, the City Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph.

11 **III. BACKGROUND FACTS**

12 3.1 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
13 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

14 3.2 The City Defendants admit the allegations of this paragraph.

15 3.3 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
16 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

17 3.4 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
18 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

19 3.5 The City Defendants admit that on the date of Mr. Wingate's arrest, Officer Whitlatch
20 was on duty as a City of Seattle Police Officer and was driving a Seattle Police Department patrol car.
21 Except as admitted, denied.

22 3.6 The City Defendants admit the allegations in this paragraph, except for the allegation
23 that Mr. Wingate was using a golf club as a cane. With regard to that allegation, the City Defendants

1 lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to its truth or falsity, and, accordingly, at this time deny
2 the same.

3 3.7 The City Defendants admit that at some point, Officer Whitlatch turned on the patrol
4 car dashboard camera. The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth
5 or falsity of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny
6 the same.

7 3.8 The City Defendants admit the allegations contained in the first sentence of this
8 paragraph. The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge as to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
9 of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

10 3.9 The City Defendants admit that Mr. Wingate was standing on the northwest corner of
11 12th Avenue and East Pike Street, and that he was holding a golf club in one hand and something else
12 in the other hand. The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or
13 falsity of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the
14 same.

15 3.10 The City Defendants admit that Officer Whitlatch parked her patrol car near where Mr.
16 Wingate was standing. The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge as to form a belief as to the
17 truth or falsity of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time
18 deny the same.

19 3.11 The City Defendants admit the allegations contained in this paragraph.

20 3.12 The City Defendants admit that Officer Whitlatch gave multiple commands using
21 varying tones for Mr. Wingate to put the golf club down. The City Defendants deny any remaining
22 allegations or characterizations at this time.

23 3.13 The City Defendants admit that, at some point, Mr. Wingate said something to the

1 effect that the golf club was his. The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to
2 the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this
3 time deny the same.

4 3.14 The City Defendants admit that Officer Whitlatch gave Mr. Wingate multiple
5 commands to put the golf club down, and that at some point referred to the golf club as a “weapon.”
6 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the
7 remaining allegations and characterizations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time
8 deny the same.

9 3.15 The City Defendants admit that Officer Whitlatch told Mr. Wingate that he was being
10 audio and video recorded. The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the
11 truth or falsity of the remaining allegations and characterizations contained in this paragraph and,
12 accordingly, at this time deny the same.

13 3.16 The City Defendants admit that Officer Whitlatch repeatedly told Mr. Wingate to put
14 his golf club down, that Mr. Wingate told her to call somebody, and that Officer Whitlatch told him
15 that she was calling someone. The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the
16 truth or falsity of the remaining allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time
17 deny the same.

18 3.17 The City Defendants admit that, at some point, Officer Whitlatch walked around the
19 front of her patrol car in the direction of where Mr. Wingate had been previously standing. The City
20 Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining
21 allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

22 3.18 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
23 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

1 3.19 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
2 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

3 3.20 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
4 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

5 3.21 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
6 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

7 3.22 The City Defendants admit that Sergeant Lam conducted the arrest screening for
8 plaintiff. The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the
9 remaining allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

10 3.23 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
11 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

12 3.24 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
13 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

14 3.25 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
15 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

16 3.26 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
17 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

18 3.27 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
19 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

20 3.28 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
21 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

22 3.29 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
23 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

1 3.30 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
2 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

3 3.31 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
4 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

5 3.32 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
6 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

7 3.33 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
8 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

9 3.34 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
10 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

11 3.35 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
12 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

13 3.36 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
14 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

15 3.37 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
16 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

17 3.38 The allegations stated in this paragraph are conclusions of law, not averments of fact
18 warranting a response. To the degree any response is warranted, the City Defendants deny the same at
19 this time.

20 3.39 The allegations stated in this paragraph are conclusions of law, not averments of fact
21 warranting a response. To the degree any response is warranted, the City Defendants deny the same at
22 this time.

23 3.40 The allegations stated in this paragraph are conclusions of law, not averments of fact

1 warranting a response. To the degree any response is warranted, the City Defendants deny the same at
2 this time.

3 3.41 The allegations stated in this paragraph are conclusions of law, not averments of fact
4 warranting a response. To the degree any response is warranted, the City Defendants deny the same at
5 this time.

6 3.42 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
7 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same.

8 3.43 The City Defendants lack sufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth or falsity
9 of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, accordingly, at this time deny the same. The
10 allegations stated in this paragraph are also conclusions of law, not averments of fact warranting a
11 response. To the degree any response is warranted, the City Defendants deny the same at this time.

12 3.44 The City Defendants admit the allegations contained in this paragraph.

13 IV. CAUSES OF ACTION

14 4.1 The City Defendants re-allege and incorporate all proceeding paragraphs.

15 4.2 The allegations stated in this paragraph are conclusions of law, not averments of fact
16 warranting a response. To the degree any response is warranted, the City Defendants deny the same at
17 this time.

18 4.3 The allegations stated in this paragraph are conclusions of law, not averments of fact
19 warranting a response. To the degree any response is warranted, the City Defendants deny the same at
20 this time.

21 4.4 The allegations stated in this paragraph are conclusions of law, not averments of fact
22 warranting a response. To the degree any response is warranted, the City Defendants deny the same at
23 this time.

1 4.5 The allegations stated in this paragraph are conclusions of law, not averments of fact
2 warranting a response. To the degree any response is warranted, the City Defendants deny the same at
3 this time.

4 4.6 The allegations stated in this paragraph are conclusions of law, not averments of fact
5 warranting a response. To the degree any response is warranted, the City Defendants deny the same at
6 this time.

7 **V. RELIEF REQUESTED**

8 5.1 The City Defendants re-allege and incorporate all proceeding paragraphs.

9 5.2(a)-(h) The City Defendants deny that plaintiff is entitled to any of the relief sought in
10 these sections.

11 **THE CITY DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

12 1. Plaintiff has failed to state a claim against the City Defendants upon which relief
13 may be granted.

14 2. The City, a municipal corporation, is immune from liability for prejudgment interest
15 on tort judgments and is immune from punitive damages.

16 3. The Seattle Police Department is not a suable entity.

17 4. The City Defendants have not violated any rights, privileges or immunities under the
18 Constitution or laws of the United States or the State of Washington or any political subdivision
19 thereof.

20 5. At all times relevant to the acts alleged in the Amended Complaint, the duties and
21 functions of the City Defendants' officials entailed the reasonable exercise of proper and lawful
22 discretion.

23 6. Any injury alleged to have been sustained was not the proximate result of any act or

1 failure to act of the City Defendants.

2 7. Plaintiff has a duty to mitigate his damages. To the extent plaintiff has failed to
3 mitigated his damages, any recovery must be reduced.

4 8. The City Defendants reserve the right to assert additional affirmative defenses as
5 may be warranted by further discovery.

6 **JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

7 The City Defendants respectfully demand a trial by jury of all issues so triable.

8 WHEREFORE, the City Defendants respectfully request that Plaintiff's Amended
9 Complaint be dismissed with prejudice, that they be awarded costs and reasonable attorneys' fees
10 herein, and that they be granted such other and further relief as the Court finds just and equitable.

11 DATED this 1st day of June, 2015.

12 PETER S. HOLMES
13 Seattle City Attorney

14 By: /s/Christine L. Olson
15 Christine L. Olson, WSBA #45416
16 Assistant City Attorney
17 Tel #: (206) 684-8251
18 E-mail: christine.olson@seattle.gov

17 701 5th Avenue, Suite 2050
18 Seattle, WA 98104-7097
(206) 684-8200

19 Attorney for the City Defendants
20
21
22
23

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the 1st day of June, 2015, I electronically filed this document with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following attorneys of record:

Attorneys for Plaintiff:

Susan B. Mindenbergs, WSBA #20545
Vonda M. Sargent, WSBA #24552
Attorneys at Law
119 First Avenue South, Suite 200
Seattle, WA 98104-2564
susanmm@msn.com, sisterlaw@me.com

Attorneys for the City Defendants:

Christine Olson, christine.olson@seattle.gov

DATED this 1st day of June, 2015, at Seattle, King County, Washington.

/s/Autumn Derrow
Autumn Derrow, Legal Assistant